

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 6, 13, and 25 are cancelled. Thus, claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-24, and 26-30 are present for examination.

Specification:

The specification has been amended to correct some minor informalities.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Beck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,723) (hereinafter Beck).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuzma (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,355).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arnold (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848).

With respect to claims 1-30, as amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an electronic mail transfer device which receives an electronic mail sent from a sending terminal through a communication line and sends at least a portion of the received electronic mail to a receiving terminal through the communication line according to an address of a destination party attached to the electronic mail, comprising:

“means for separating a body of the electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data;

means for inserting an identifier associated with the second data into the first data; and

means for sending only the first data with the identifier to the receiving terminal;

wherein the identifier permits retrieval of the second data by the receiving terminal.” (Emphasis Added).

An electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages that: (i) a means for separating allows for separating a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data; (ii) a means for inserting allows for inserting an identifier associated with the second data into the first data; (iii) a means for sending allows for sending only the first data with the identifier to a receiving terminal; and (iv) the identifier permits for retrieval of the second data by the receiving terminal. (Specification; page 5, lines 14-17; page 11, lines 6-7 and 21-26; page 13, lines 5-7; page 14, lines 3-6 and 21-23; FIG. 4).

Beck neither discloses nor suggests an electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features that allows for separating a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data. Beck draws a distinction between: (a) e-mail messages; and (b) “attachments” that may be attached to the e-mail messages. (Beck; column 1, lines 23-53). The “attachments” in the system of Beck are never part of the body of the e-mail messages. (Beck; column 1, lines 23-53; FIG. 4, references 401 and 402). As a consequence, Beck never separates a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data, because Beck never separates the data within a primary e-mail message. (Beck; column 1, lines 36-41).

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Beck reference and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Similarly, Kuzma neither discloses nor suggests an electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features that allows for separating a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data. Kuzma draws a distinction between: (a) e-mail messages; and (b) “attachments” that may be attached to the e-mail messages. (Kuzma; column 1, lines 22-52). The “attachments” in the system of Kuzma are never part of the body of the e-mail messages. (Kuzma; column 1, lines 22-52; FIG. 4, references 401 and 402). As a

consequence, Kuzma never separates a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data, because Kuzma never separates the data within a primary e-mail message. (Kuzma; column 1, lines 36-41).

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Kuzma reference and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Moreover, Arnold neither discloses nor suggests an electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features that allows for separating a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data. Arnold draws a distinction between: (a) data within a body of an e-mail message; and (b) attachments to e-mail messages. (Arnold; column 1, lines 13-38). The attachments in the system of Arnold are never part of the body of the e-mail messages. (Arnold; column 1, lines 29-34). As a consequence, Arnold never separates a body of an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the body of the received electronic mail includes the second data, because the system of Arnold merely detaches an attachment from an e-mail message without separating any data that is within a body of the e-mail message. (Arnold; abstract).

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Arnold reference and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 8 recites an electronic mail transfer system with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 8 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 15 recites an electronic mail transfer method with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 15 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 23 recites an electronic mail transfer device with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 23 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 29 recites an electronic mail transfer device with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 29 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 30 recites an electronic mail transfer method with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 30 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 23, 2006

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (310) 975-7965
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252